

COPY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/734,637	12/12/00	VOLGAS	HCC-9 (306*141)

EXAMINER

LOVERING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1712

5

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) MR. ASHLEY PEZNER (C) _____
(2) MR. RICHARD D. LOVERING (4) _____

Date of Interview AUG. 28, 2002

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 29, 36, 39, 42, 47, 49 & 51

Identification of prior art discussed: APPLIED ART IN GENERAL.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: APPLICANT WILL AMEND

TO OVERCOME PRIOR ART REJECTIONS BY ADDING COMPONENT (C) AN OIL THICKENER WHICH IS SILICON
BASED TO CLAIMS 29, 47 & 51, AND CANCEL CLAIMS 36, 39 & 49; (2) ADDING PROVIDE THAT THERE IS
< 10% WATER TO CLAIMS 42, 47 & 51; APPLICANTS WILL AMEND TO OVERCOME 112, 20P REJECTIONS
AND WILL SUBMIT TERMINAL DISCLAIMER TO ORBULATE OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION.
APPLICANTS WILL CANCEL CLAIMS TO NON-ELECTED INVENTION, AND AMEND TO CORRECT INVENTORSHIP OF
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable DELETING
must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be ONE OF
attached.) ORIGINAL
CO-INVENTORS

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

703-308-0443

FORM PTOL-413 (REV. 2-98)

Richard D. Lovering
RICHARD D. LOVERING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1700

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/734,637	VOLGAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel S. Metzmaier	1712	

All Participants:

(1) Daniel S. Metzmaier.

(2) Richard M. Beck.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 April 2005

Time: ~ 11:0 AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims discussed:

42, 52, and 56.

Prior art documents discussed:

none.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



DANIEL S. METZMAIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 1712

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: examiner proposed amending claim 42 to define the composition in the preamble as a "concentrate" and to limit the water content to "less than 10% water". Examiner proposed explicitly setting forth the % as "by weight", which is the only % disclosed in the disclosure. Discussed the original claims 38 and 41 as basis for the water content limitation. Applicants' representative authorized said amendments by examiner's amendment and authorized charging the deposit account 03-2775 the required fee of \$120 for the One Month extension of time.